

SOUTHEASTERN SAN DIEGO PLANNING GROUP

BOARD MINUTES

Monday, June 10, 2019, 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Mountain View Community Center, 641 South Boundary St., San Diego CA 92113
Contact: Steve Veach (SVeach80@aol.com, 619-238-4537)

City of San Diego Southeastern San Diego Planning Group website:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/southeasternsd/plan>

Agendas and Minutes:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/southeasternsd/agendas>

This Planning Group covers the area south of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway (Highway 94), east of Interstate 5, north of the border of National City, and west of Interstate 805. It includes the communities of Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, Grant Hill, Memorial, Stockton, Mount Hope, Mountain View, Southcrest, and Shelltown.

1. **CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Steve Veach, Chair, resident
Louise Torio, Projects Secretary and Board Secretary today, resident
Jaime Capella, resident
Oscar Gomez, resident
Robert Leif, property owner
Aaron Magagna, business owner
Vincent Noto, resident
Lamont Pargo, resident
Myron Taylor, Vice Chair, resident
Alli Urguby, resident
Kerry Wesson, resident
Reggie Womack, Treasurer, resident
[not in attendance: residents Chelsea Klaseus (Secretary), Dale Huntington]

The Chair introduced himself, welcomed Board members and guests to the meeting, and explained the purpose of this planning group, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City of San Diego regarding land use issue in this area.

2. **ADOPT THE AGENDA**

Motion by Torio, seconded by Leif, to adopt the agenda, minus the approval of Board meeting minutes April 13, 2019, since the Board Secretary was not able to attend this June meeting, and with the Annual Report discussion (D) happening before the CIP discussion (C). Approved 12-0-0.

3. **MEETING MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL: Meeting Minutes from ~~4/13/19~~ and 5/13/19**

Motion by Magagna, seconded by Capella, to accept the 5/13/19 minutes. Approved 12-0-0.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** (the public may speak on matters not on the agenda, for a maximum of up to two minutes)

Torio thanked all who attended the free June 1, 2019, interior tours of the Villa Montezuma Museum. The next free tours will be on Saturday, August 17, 2019. Registration is through the City's event website at www.SDRecConnect.com. See www.VillaMontezumaMuseum.org for more information about this City-owned 1887 historic site.

5. **REPORTS**

- A. Elected Officials' Staff Reports (Districts 4, 8, and 9)

D4: no rep/no report.

D8: Eddie Padilla could not attend but sent a report. On Saturday, June 15, 2019, all are encouraged to attend the Juneteenth Celebration to be held on the 2900 block of Imperial Avenue. For over 50 years the Cooper Family Foundation has been hosting this event. See www.cfjuneteenth.com for more information.

D9: Gloria Cardenas gave an update of the City's vote on the budget for the next fiscal year and provided the FY20 Priority Capital Improvement Program Projects supported by the Council President. Unfortunately, none of the projects proposed for the Southeastern San Diego Planning Group region got funded.

Council President Gomez will hold a coffee on Wednesday, June 12, from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m. here at the Mountain View Community Center to hear about issues or concerns from residents. If you plan on attending, please send your RSVP to gcardenas@sandiego.gov or call 619-236-6681.

- B. City Departments: none

- C. Civic San Diego: none

- D. Chair Report: All new members must take the E-COW to be indemnified to serve on the SSDPG if you didn't attend the May 18 in-person training. Please send your proof of COW to the Chair. <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/resources>

- E. CPC Representative Report: Myron Taylor said there will be an ad hoc committee to discuss additional training for members of community planning groups. All are encouraged to see the training opportunities at the link above.

The CPC also discussed SB-330, the Housing Crisis Bill of 2019, and SB-50, the proposal to increase housing density along transit corridors. Neither proposed bill made it out of State committee. If these bills become law the City might lose control over what gets built on transit corridors. These potential bills will have further discussion and we may see them move forward in a future legislative session.

6. **INFORMATION ITEMS**: None

7. **CONSENT ITEMS**: None

8. ACTION ITEMS:

A. Project No. 549188; 440 1/3 35th Street (Homes at 35th & J), Mount Hope

Site Development Permit (Process 3) and Tentative Map (Process 4) for the subdivision of 21 lots and the development of 20 dwelling units, each with a companion unit with separate entry way, totaling 29,110 square feet of floor area with open parking (Affordable Housing Expedite Program). The project includes 15 percent affordable units (two units), density bonus of 50 percent, and is requesting four deviations. The 0.89-acre site is located in the RM-1-1 zone(s) of the Southeastern San Diego Community Plan Area within Council District 9. Presented by Craig Howard, DeBartolo + Rimanic Design Studio (DBRDS). See the minutes from the Projects Committee of May 20, 2019.

Craig Howard said his firm resubmitted this project to the City about two and a half weeks ago, so there is no further feedback from the City. This project proposes to use the City's Small Lot Ordinance regulations to construct 18 detached for-sale 2-bedroom units with an attached lower-level companion unit with separate entry. In addition, there will be 2 very low income affordable 3-bedroom units per the City's Affordable Housing regulations. The two lower levels will be stucco, and the top level wood. The units will have solar panels, and rain water will be captured and reclaimed. They have no ideas at what price they will market these units. The intent is to have owner-occupants reside there, but the developer can't control if investors buy the units. The nearest mass transit is almost half a mile away.

The developer seeks the support of the project with the following Small Lot Ordinance incentives (these are not deviations):

1. remove the angled building requirement of Municipal Code section 131.0444.
2. increase the maximum Floor Area Ration (FAR) allowed from 0.75:1 to 0.78:1.
3. Decrease the required rear setback from 15'0" to 5'0".
4. Increase the height limit from 36'0" to 42'0".
5. Decrease the required front setback from 15'0" to 6'6".

The concern from the Projects Committee were read, including the concerns of area residents. The designer made the following changes or comments regarding the feedback from the Projects meeting:

- Investigated provided angled street parking, but this isn't possible since the street isn't at least 40 feet wide.
- Lighting: provided an illustration showing possible placement of lights throughout the project area, including a new street light on the sidewalk.
- Added pedestrian gates for the drive aisle, so people cannot easily wander into this parking area that don't live on site.
- There isn't enough room to add additional bike lockers.
- Explored saving and moving the existing tree that is on site, but since the site will be totally graded it doesn't appear there is a spot to relocate the tree while construction work would take place. Cost to move tree: \$2,000-\$3,000.
- They will look at a 75-foot area in the middle of the site for possible a dog run or a place where residents can gather or barbeque.

Craig Howard said that the distance from the furthest unit to the trash cans is about 225 feet, and that the trash cans cannot be moved to a more central location since the trash trucks must access the trash bins through the drive aisle and parking lot. This parking lot and drive aisle is large enough to accommodate fire trucks.

The SSDPG had the following concerns:

- ✓ This project is not “20 units with a companion unit,” it’s really 40 total units. This is high density with absolutely no amenities for residents. It may meet the City’s requirement to have 21 parking spaces (the current design has 24 parking spaces), but, as area residents have attested, street parking is already highly packed, with neighbors already illegally parking on both sides of the too-narrow street. Widening the street to bring in additional street parking will not net additional spaces, since the existing neighborhood is already using that area for parking. It’s quite possible that each resident in 40 units will have a car; realistically, it’s quite possible there will be two adults with vehicles. How will the area absorb up to 80 resident vehicles when the lot can only accommodate 24 parking spaces? Where will guests park? How far away will residents who actually can park in the lot need to go to bring groceries to their homes? How will move-ins occur if there is no ability to park near the home unit? Who decides who gets an assigned parking spot in the parking lot? Is there an HOA-type organization to these unit-with-companion-unit homes? How are group site concerns addressed?
- ✓ Six units have no patios, so there is no outside space for these residents to use. These are not condos. It would almost be better if these were condos so patio space and amenities could be designed into the project.
- ✓ We encourage all developers to use products and not cheapen out when it comes to installing good windows and quality lighting products. These buildings should not look flimsy due to poor quality materials.
- ✓ The City may not have asked the developer for a lighting plan, but since this will not be gated and area residents have stated that there is a problem with homeless people gathering on that street and in the nearby canyon, lighting will be very important for security. In looking at the proposed location of possible lights, the SSDPG saw the need for additional lights between the buildings so there are no dark corridors.
- ✓ Will there be security cameras on the property, including on the parked cars, the bike storage, and the trash/recycle areas? The designer said that they do not yet have SDPD review, so at this time no security cameras are planned.
- ✓ If landscaping will be used to screen these units from looking into the yards and windows of existing homes, will mature trees be used so it doesn’t take years to block the view?
- ✓ It’s not feasible to think that all residents will be able to carry their trash almost the length of a city block to reach the trash receptacle area. Will there be trash bins located closer to the outer areas that can be pushed to the trash collection area, so that seniors don’t have to find a way to haul their trash so far away? The designer said that there is no room for trash bins other than in the existing location.

- ✓ Would a possible dog run next to a possible barbeque area, all within a 75-foot area, really be compatible?
- ✓ We are not against development in our area, but we ask every developer to envision living in what they are proposing we accept in our community. Would the owner of this property want to live there? Want their family member to live there? Would they be happy with having the small parking lot for 40 units? This project could be designed to be quite an asset if it had less units and more living space for residents. As currently designed, it is way too dense and not very livable. Why build for-sale homes that from the start are designed to be overcrowded and unpleasant to live in?

Motion by Capella, seconded by Womack, to not support this project as designed. Motion failed 5-7-0 (voted for the motion of non-support of the project: Capella, Taylor, Torio, Veach, Womack).

Motion by Magagna, seconded by Pargo, to support the project with the recommendations from the Projects Committee that this project needs better parking, lighting, security cameras, a plan on how to help residents get their trash to the trash bins, mature landscaping for screening for existing nearby homes, and some kind of recreation area as at least one amenity in this overly dense project. Approved 7-5-0 (voted for the motion of support with the SSDPG and area residents' concerns noted: Magagna, Pargo, Gomez, Leif, Noto, Torio, Urguby).

B. Project No. 598090, 2561 G Street, Dolan Duplex, Grant Hill

A Variance to reduce the front yard setback from a 15-foot minimum and 20-foot standard, to a 10-foot front yard setback, to construct a 3,980-square-foot, three stories, two dwelling units over garages located at 2561 G Street (Process 3). The 0.08-acre site is located within the RM-2-5 zone of the Southeastern Community Plan area. Council District 8. Presented by Randy Biegenzahn, Ehm Architecture. See the minutes from the Projects Committee of May 20, 2019.

The designer provided a new update from the City. This project is in the Transit Overlay Zone, so parking is not an issue (the project does have underground resident parking). This was designed to the old codes; current codes require a 20-foot setback (instead of 15 feet) and a 20-foot driveway if the site is over 50 feet wide (the site is 50.8 feet). The applicant seeks support of these two variances.

The project owner has been a lifelong resident on this block (since 1957) and owns other buildings on the block. This is designed to house two families. The trash cans will be gated on the side. The colorway for the building is designed to blend with the existing building on the block.

The SSDPG reiterated that the use of quality materials for windows and lights goes a long way in keeping the site from looking old quickly.

Motion by Urguby, seconded by Wesson, to support this project and the two variances requested. Approved 12-0-0.

C. Capital Improvements Priorities

See <https://www.sandiego.gov/facilitiesfinancing/plans/southeastern> for the Southeastern Public Facilities Needs for a listing of previously identified needs in transportation, park and recreation, library, and fire protection. See the Projects Committee minutes of May 20, 2019, for additional ideas. Motion by Torio, seconded by Noto, to have the Projects Committee review at the June 24 Projects meeting and bring recommendations to the July Board meeting. Approved 11-0-0 (Womack left the meeting).

D. SSDPG Annual Report (April 2018 – March 2019)

The SSDPG reviewed the Annual Report prepared by the Chair. Motion by Leif, seconded by Capella, to accept the report. Approved 11-0-0 (Womack left the meeting).

9. ADJOURNMENT: at 7:55 p.m.